BX
6955
B4

the university of connecticut libraries

hbl, stx

BX 6955.B4

Word of a woman, versus the word o

3 9153 00563892 1

BX/6955/B4

THE WORD OF A WOMAN
VERSUS
THE WORD OF GOD

A. E. BELL

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/wordofwomanversu00bell

Copyright 1917
By Alvin E. Bell
Toledo, Ohio

Dedicated to

MY DEAR MOTHER

Whose healing of a serious malady without "Christian Science" (as referred to in these pages) represents the scientific truth which Eddyism prostitutes into a religio-commercial heresy.

A. E. B.

PREFATORY NOTE

By FREDERICK W. PEABODY, L. L. B.,
of Boston, Mass.

(Attorney for Mrs. Josephine C. Woodbury in her suit for libel against Mrs. Eddy; also for Mrs. Eddy's sons in their suit against her, and for McClure's magazine and others in matters pertaining to Mrs. Eddy and her sham religion; author of "The Religio-Medical Masquerade.")

Probably no one is more familiar with the literature on "Christian Science," pro and con, than myself, and with most of those who have written against it, I enjoy personal acquaintance. Having had the privilege of reading Mr. Bell's book in manuscript, I strogly feel it to be the clearest and most concise and convincing demonstration that has been written of the anti-Christian character of the bogus thing Mrs. Eddy shamelessly miscalled "Christian Science." Not only does he show the impossibility of reconciling the word of the woman with the Word of God, but he makes plain the great importance of open, uncompromising warfare against Eddyism by all Christian people, especially the ministry, that the evil thing may be overthrown and brought to naught. One can not love Christ and tolerate Mrs. Eddy. It is devoutly to be wished that this little book should reach the hands of every lover of Christ.

FREDERICK W. PEABODY.

CONTENTS

First Lecture
Eddyism In the Light of History and Science.

Second Lecture
Eddyism's Atrocities In Its War on
Holy Scriptures.

Third Lecture
Eddyism's Lesson to True Christianity.

INTRODUCTION.

REGARD and esteem for a young man of whose Christian character and fidelity the writer knows something have prevailed with him in the request with which he has been honored to prepare this brief introduction.

In the delightful days when we sustained the one to the other the relation of teacher and student, the older of the two discovered in the author of these addresses, a capacity to stand and maintain where the truth of the Gospel was an issue.

In this booklet he has in a modest but forceful way provided something to in some degree counteract the baneful effects of the old Athenian "itching for new things." He has dealt some effective blows at one of the most specious and dangerous heretical fads of our day.

Whatever continues to live, lives by means of the truth which it contains and not by its errors. A pseudo-science does not necessarily consist entirely of lies. The thing discussed in these discourses and popularly known as "Christian Science" but which should always with more discrimination be called "Eddyism," after the name of its one and only high-priestess, lives and for a time thrives, solely because of the modicum of truth

upon which it has seized and which has always been known to medical practitioners.

It is a heresy which under the name of a "science" is constantly contradicting the testimony of the senses, sorely trying one's patience in its doctrine of matter, and one whose absurdities should thus be pointed out in divers ways and from different stand-points as is done in these discourses.

Mrs. Eddy, when she lived, was not noted for the modesty of her claims. She did not hesitate to pronounce all of our real science false, our philosophies absurd, our Churches "material, unspiritual and unhelping."

Her disciples, accordingly, need not wonder if the champions of the Churches and the faith confessed by them, handle with some vigor her absurd claims to be both "Christian" and "scientific."

An examination of what my esteemed student and brother, the author, sends forth in this timely treatise, leads me to feel assured that in his time and place he has vigorously reaffirmed an old warning which has the sanction of a great teacher, "Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science, falsely so-called, which some professing, have erred concerning the faith."

DAVID H. BAUSLIN.

The Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio
Lent 1917.

EDDYISM IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY AND SCIENCE

TEXTS

Matthew 7: 15.—"Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

Matthew 7: 22-23.—"Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye that work iniquity."

N the tenth chapter of Revelation, St. John portrays his vision of a mighty angel come down from heaven having "in his hand a little book open" which he invites his hearers to take and "eat it up."

The founder of the so-called "Christian Science" in her "Key to the Scriptures" makes bold to persuade us that this angel is herself and this little book her own book "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," which she does not hesitate to say is a "higher, clearer and more permanent" revelation than Jesus brought to earth.

But since we remember that Mormonism has sought to thrust its hideous, bloody, adulterous religion upon the world on the strength of its claim that that same little book in the angel's hand was the "Book of Mormon" we feel justified in refusing to be over-credulous as to the identity between that

little book and "Science and Health" or any other purported revelation which claims to be "higher, clearer, and more permanent" than the teachings of Jesus the Christ.

We cannot help feeling in entire agreement with Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, the great English preacher, when he finds the identity of the author of this false religion, not in the angel with the little book of Revelation, but in the Jezebel, of whom the risen Christ spoke in his letter to the Church at Thyatira, and rebuked that Church, for not opposing her ungodly teachings in the words: "I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed to idols."

This great divine, who is recognized by many as one of the greatest preachers in the world to-day, says, "The latest of all heresies which names itself by conjunction of words, Christian and Science, of all the facts concerning which it is profoundly ignorant, is but the galvanizing of a mummy, under the inspiration of yet another woman calling herself a prophetess. This latter day manifestation, dealt with philosophically, might be treated as the amusement of a passing hour, but the terrible effect it is producing among the servants of God, should call the Church to new attention to our Lord's message to Thyatira, and the estimate of his view of a Church that suffers such awful teaching."

Conscience, and Christ's rebuke to Thyatira forbid this congregation or its pastor to sit silent-

ly here in this neighborhood almost side by side with this institution of Jezebel without raising the voice of divine truth against its ungodly, unchristian, soul-destroying teachings. "Because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel which calleth herself a prophetess to teach and seduce my people."

The founder of the so-called "Christian Science," and author of "Science and Health" was born at Bow, N. H., July 16, 1821, and in spite of some thirty-five years of public denial of the reality and possibility of death, she went the way of all the earth on December 3, 1910. Born in poverty, and for many years of her life dependent upon relatives and acquaintances as a professional visitor, she so shrewdly commercialized the sale of her "divine revelation" that she left an estate valued in the millions.

On April 14, 1883, in the first number of her "Journal of Christian Science" she was modest enough to say, "We shall claim no especial gifts from our *divine origin,* or any supernatural power."

According to her autobiography "Retrospection and Introspection," she like Christ, disputed with the wise men in the temple at the age of *twelve* upon the occasion of her reception into the Congregational Church of the village. The debate was on the doctrine of predestination which she refused to accept, and so eloquently did the *twelve* year old child argue with the doctors that even the minister broke down and wept, and received her into the Church on her own conditions.

In Retrospection and Introspection, Page 12, she says "At the age of *twelve* I was admitted to

the Congregational Church." It is all so beautiful and touching that it seems a shame that some iconoclast has dug up the old church record showing the date of her reception into the Church to be July 26, 1838, at which time this modern prophetess was *seventeen years and ten days* instead of *twelve years* of age. Are we unreasonable in suggesting that a prophetess who is to give the world a revelation "higher, clearer and more permanent" than that of Jesus should at least be capable of more exactness (if not to say truthfulness) in the trivial every-day affairs of her own life, if she expects us to believe her statements in the weightier matters which concern our own souls, or if we are to give her purported revelations higher authority than those of Jesus Christ in whose lips was no guile neither was any deceit found in his mouth?

In "Retrospection and Introspection," page 10, Mrs. Eddy says: "My father was taught to believe that my brain was too large for my body and so kept me much out of school." But from other sources we learn that the reason she went so irregularly to school was the fact that she was subject from infancy to convulsive attacks of an hysterical nature which the neighbors called "fits." As child and woman she suffered from this extremely nervous and neurotic condition and no proper estimate of her peculiarly interesting life can be made without taking this into consideration.

She goes on to tell us that as a child her "favorite studies were Natural Philosophy, Logic and Moral Science" and that "from her brother Albert she received lessons in the ancient tongues, Hebrew, Greek and Latin." Various of her school-

mates, however, assert that "Mary Baker completed her education when she had finished Smith's Grammar and had reached long division in arithmetic."

She then goes on to state "After my discovery of Christian Science most of the knowledge I had gleaned from school books vanished like a dream" and "learning was so illumined that grammar was eclipsed" and no one who has ever tried to get any logic, sense or science out of her writings will be inclined to dispute her as to this *"vanishing"* of any knowledge she may previously have had, at least Mark Twain does not dispute it in his book on Christian Science.

On page 28 of "Retrospection and Introspection," Mrs. Eddy says: "It was in Massachusetts in the year 1866 that I discovered the Science of Divine Metaphysical Healing which I afterwards named Christian Science. The discovery came to pass in this way. During twenty years prior to my discovery I had been trying to trace all physical effects to a mental cause; and in the latter part of 1866 I gained the scientific certainty that all causation was Mind, and every effect a mental phenomenon."

But in a letter to the Boston Post, March 7, 1883, she says. "We made our first experiment in mental healing about 1853, when we were convinced that mind had a science, which, if understood would heal all disease.

Again, in the first edition of "Science and Health" (1875), she says, "We made our first discovery that science mentally applied would heal

the sick, in 1864, and since then have tested it on ourselves and hundreds of others."

Again, in the Christian Science Journal of June 1887, she says: "As long ago as 1844 I was convinced that mortal mind produced all disease, and that the various medical systems were in no proper sense scientific."

Certainly there is plenty of variety here and we may take our choice as to *which Mrs. Eddy* we are going to believe as our prophetess, who comes to us, as she says, with "an idea given of God, this time higher, clearer and more permanent than before" was given through Jesus or any other who preceeded her.

Which Mrs. Eddy will you choose as more reliable than Jesus as a revealer of divine ideas? The Mrs. Eddy of 1875 who dates her divine revelation in 1864? or the Mrs. Eddy of 1883 who dates it in 1853? *or* the Mrs. Eddy of 1887 who dates it in 1884? Or will you take the last Mrs. Eddy of 1892 and later years, who has finally decided it should be dated neither 1864, nor 1853, nor 1844, but 1866?

These differences of figures together with the *fact* that her third marriage license, dated January 1, 1877 states her age *forty years* while in fact she was *fifty-five* the preceeding July, and taken in connection also with the enormous difference between the amount of property she owned and the amount upon which she paid taxes to the commonwealth of Massachusetts, do form a considerable of a stumbling block to one who might be inclined to accept her as a prophetess with a "higher, clearer and more permanent" revelation of TRUTH than

that borne to the world by HIM whom all agree is, as He said, "the Way, the TRUTH and the Life."

But history throws still clearer light upon the date of this prophetess' so-called divine revelation in "Christian Science." Permit me to state it as concisely as possible, for it is a long, long story which has been discussed at length in court and in newspaper and magazine articles and books, certainly not to the entire satisfaction of any Christian Scientist who is as anxious for the truth as for the vindication of Mrs. Eddy. Briefly stated it is this: *There is not a single tenet in all her system of false teaching which is in any wise fundamental or essential to it, but that was taught, practiced, and set down in writing by one P. P. Quimby of Portland, Me., at least two years before Mrs. Eddy, (then still bearing the name of her second husband) ever knew anything about P. P. Quimby or the system of healing which he already called "Christian Science," or before he ever knew anything about the existence of Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Patterson who came to him in the autumn of 1862 for healing, broken in body, mind and purse.*

Years before he ever heard of Mrs. Patterson, Quimby was thoroughly convinced that he had discovered the "Truth" and "Science" which would solve all of the problems and ills of life and ultimately would be accepted by all the world. To explain it to anyone who would listen to him, to write it out and transmit it to posterity, was his one consuming passion of life. In Mrs. Patterson he found a willing pupil. She drank in his philosophy by the hour. She was healed by him of

the ills of a lifetime. She carried back with her some of his manuscripts containing his exposition of his philosophy which he called by various names such as, "Science of Health," "Science of Health and Happiness," "Science of Christ," "Christian Science," "The Principle," "The Truth" and "Wisdom."

From these manuscripts of Quimby's Mrs. Patterson taught his "Science" to all who could be persuaded to listen to her in private and in public, and she taught it as not her discovery but Quimby's.

It is these manuscripts, still extant, and bearing dates earlier than that of Mrs. Patterson's first meeting with Quimby, which contain virtually the entire philosophy which Mrs. Eddy claims came to her directly as an immediate, clear and distinct, divine revelation either in 1844, 1853, 1864 or 1866 according as she is hard-pressed by denying one or the other of the many stubborn and well-authenticated facts of the Quimby controversy.

The light of history is as clear as day to those who will see, that this modern prophetess who comes to us with a divine revelation, "higher, clearer and more permanent" than that which Jesus brought, received her "revelation" not from God, but from a man, *by plagiarism*, sometime between October 1862 and the time of the death of her great benefactor Quimby on January 16, 1866.

On February 14 following his death she wrote to Mr. Julius Dresser, her friend and a former pupil of Quimby's, expressing her grief over Quimby's death and pleading with Dresser to take up his work and be his successor and come and heal her of an injury received from a fall on the ice two weeks

before. She enclosed a poem of four stanzas in which she gushed over Quimby and all he had done for her.

It did not however, appeal to Dresser to become Quimby's successor, so, forthwith Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Patterson prepared to assume the throne where she reigned until her death, with an absolutism and with an assumed infallibility which no pope in Rome has ever dared to imitate. From the purchasing of souvenir spoons and photographs of herself at exorbitant prices or coming at her call and acting as her domestic in her mansion to the acceptance of her as a revealer of divine ideas superior to Jesus or Paul, her will and wish have never been crossed by the faithful.

But the most startling thing about Mrs. Eddy as a divinely inspired prophetess is her *base ingratitude* to the man from whom she learned her entire philosophy, her real friend in need, the "Much-loved friend" as she called him, whose praises she once could not find words strong enough to express without resorting to silly poetry. She and her followers repudiated Quimby as a mesmerist and hypnotist from whom she received nothing worth mentioning, whose manuscripts were so miserably botched that Mrs. Eddy had to make so many corrections in them that they became *virtually her own.*

But Mrs. Eddy (or Mrs. Patterson as she was then) is Mrs. Eddy's worst opponent. Her own former published utterances are constantly arising like Banquo's ghost to put her to confusion.

After the publication of some of the most damaging of these letters of hers, she writes in the

Boston Post of March 7, 1883: "Did I write those articles purporting to be mine? I might have written them twenty or thirty years ago, for I was under the mesmeric treatment of Dr. Quimby from 1862 until his death. . . . My head was so turned by animal magnetism and will power under treatment that I might have written something as hopelessly incorrect as the articles now published in the Dresser pamphlet. I was not healed until after the death of Mr. Quimby; and then healing came as the result of my discovery, in 1866, of the science of Mind-healing, since named "Christian Science."

How do we know she was not under mesmeric influence, or the influence of animal magnetism when she wrote "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures"? That certainly seems to be about the only way to explain how any one claiming to have any regard for holy scriptures could write as complete and total a contradiction to God's Word as we find in her book, for example the following:

"Christian Science" says, "Man is incapable of sin." The Bible says, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

"Christian Science" says, "Sin exists only so long as the material illusion remains." The Bible says, "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us."

"Christian Science" says, "It is the sense of sin and not the sinful soul which must be lost." The Bible says, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "I am come to seek and to save that which is lost."

"Christian Science" says, "Man is never sick;

for mind is not sick and matter cannot be." The Bible says, "In those days was Hezekiah the king *sick.*" "And I Daniel fainted and *was sick* certain days." "Simon's wife's mother lay *sick* of a fever." "They that are whole need not a physician but *they that are sick.*"

"Christian Science" says, "Matter and death are but mortal illusions." "The body cannot die."

The Bible says, "It is appointed unto men once to die." "The body without the spirit is dead."

"Christian Science" says, "His disciples believed Jesus dead while he was hidden in the sepulchre *whereas he was alive.*" "Jesus students saw him after his resurrection and *learned that he had not died.*" "His unchanged physical condition after what *seemed to be death.*"

The Bible says "Christ *died* for our sins." Jesus Christ himself said; "I am He that liveth and was dead."

"Christian Science" says, "Man is coexistent with God." "Self-existent and eternal like God." "Man is neither young nor old; he has neither birth nor death." "Man originated not from dust." "The supposition that soul or mind is breathed into matter is a pantheistic error."

The Bible says, "As for man his days are as grass; as the flower of the field so he flourisheth." "What is your life, it is even a vapor which appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away." "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

"Christian Science" says, "Man is perfect now,

henceforth and forever." The Bible says, "If I justify myself mine own mouth shall condemn me; if I say I am perfect it shall also prove me perverse."

"Christian Science" says, "God is not a person." "God as a Principle not a person, saves man." "God is Spirit and Spirit is divine Principle." "Prayer to a personal God is a hindrance." "The theory of three persons in one God suggests heathen gods." "God is divine Principle."

According to this instead of giving his name to Moses as "I am that I am," God, being impersonal principle, should have said His name was "It seems that it seems."

"Christian Science" says "The spiritual Christ was infallible; Jesus as material manhood was not Christ." The Bible says, *"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ."*

"Christian Science" says, "The material blood of Jesus was no more efficacious to cleanse from sin, when it was shed upon the accursed tree, than it was flowing through his veins as he went daily about his Father's business."

The Bible says, "Without *shedding* of blood is no remission of sins." "This is my blood of the new testament which is *shed* for you and for many for the remission of sins." "Having made peace through the *blood of his cross."*

"Christian Science" defines "Holy Ghost" as "Divine Science." The Bible says, "Who hath put it in thine heart to lie *unto the Holy Ghost?* Thou hast not lied unto men but *unto God."*

"Christian Science" says, "There is no final

judgment." The Bible says, "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."

"Christian Science" says, "Prayer to a personal God is a hindrance." The Bible says, "For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee."

"Christian Science" says, "A man or woman having voluntarily entered into wedlock, and accepted the claims of the marriage covenant, is held in Christian Science as morally bound to fulfill all of the claims growing out of this contract, UNLESS SUCH CLAIMS ARE RELINQUISHED BY MUTUAL CONSENT OF BOTH PARTIES, OR THIS CONTRACT IS LEGALLY DISSOLVED." The Bible says, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

Mrs. Patterson having divorced her second husband *on unscriptural grounds* and contracted a third marriage to one Gilbert A. Eddy in what Christ, in the sermon on the Mount, clearly condemns as an *adulterous marriage,* is thus again seen coming to men and women as a prophetess with "a revelation higher, clearer and more permanent" than that of Jesus on this question of marriage and divorce, *and she practiced what she preached!*

In the name of the Blessed Son of God, Jesus Christ, the very incarnation of TRUTH, which will you accept—the *Word of such a woman* or the *Word of God?*

Do you wonder that such men as the great, conservative preacher, Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, see in this woman the reincarnation of the Jezebel of Thyratira, the very *anti-Christ* of Scripture? Do you wonder now that I have taken as our text,

Christ's words about false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravening wolves whom He will cast off in the judgment as those whom He never knew?

The very first requirement of any study deserving the name of "science" is *accuracy;* especially is this the case when the scientist professes to be divinely inspired to give a revelation "higher, clearer and more permanent than that before," viz. than that which before came through prophets, apostles and even Jesus.

Permit me to give just one more illustration of the fact that Mrs. Eddy is absolutely incapable of accuracy even in the things in which a veritable ignoramus in science or theology ought to be able to speak correctly.

In "Retrospection and Introspection" Mrs. Eddy says: "My ancestors, according to the flesh, were from both Scotland and England, my great-grand-father on my father's side being John McNeil of Edinburgh. . . . . In the line of my grand-mother Baker's family was the late Sir John McNeil, a Scotch knight who was prominent in British politics and at one time held the position of ambassador to Persia."

These same statements were published in the November, 1903, issue of the Ladies' Home Journal in a two page article, first submitted to and approved by Mrs. Eddy. These published statements soon reached a descendent of the Sir John McNeil, Mrs. Florence McAlister of Aberdeen, Scotland, who if the prophetess of Boston had been correct *should have been Mrs. Eddy's mother.* Mrs. McAlister was not at all flattered by Mrs. Eddy's offering to

be her *daughter* and spoke in no uncertain tones to that effect in letters addressed to Mrs. Eddy, the Ladies' Home Journal and to the London Truth. Neither Mrs. Eddy nor the Ladies' Home Journal had conscience enough to make a proper apology or correction. Mrs. McAlister's statement in part is: "I am the only married grand-child of the late Rt. Hon. Sir John McNeil, G.C.B. (Grand Cross of the Bath) of Edinburgh, who was prominent in British politics and ambassador to Persia" and *Mrs. Eddy is certainly not my daughter.* I wrote to the editor of the Ladies' Home Journal, who published Mrs. Eddy's statement, asking him to publish a correction, and I sent a copy of the letter to Mrs. Eddy herself. She did not reply at all, and he excused himself from publishing it on the ground that the correction could not appear for five months." From a *scientist* who has no clearer record in the matter of exactness (not to say honesty) than this one, the microscope, the telescope, the X-ray, the test tube and crucible have very, very little to fear even though she professes to bring a revelation "higher, clearer and more permanent that that before" came through Jesus.

Time forbids our discussion from the standpoint of science, of Mrs. Eddy's repeated and unqualified repudiation of the existence in reality of any matter such as the earth, stars, planets, the human body with its organs and members, or her repudiation of all of the useful sciences, inventions and discoveries, or how, after such sciences as medicine, surgery, bacteriology and the like have succeeded in recent years in saving thousands of lives and thus raising the average length of human

life, Mrs. Eddy *boldly and brazenly attributes to herself* and her "science" this increase in the average length of life which has come about since 1875.

But there is a truth in "Christian Science." It is the truth of the power of suggestion and of the influence of mind over body. You yourselves may know as I do some good people who conscientiously believe and affirm that "Christian Science" has healed them of bodily diseases. Eddyism makes much of its reputed cures as being the stamp of God's approval upon its being the very Christianity of Christ.

But before we *swallow the hook* let us not forget that John Alexander Dowie and the innumerable Roman Catholic shrines, and pictures and relics and shin-bones of St. Anne, have more of such cures to their credit than "Christian Science" has ever offered in evidence or claimed to have effected.

I may be permitted an illustration from personal experience which might have made a Christian Scientist of me if this heresy had had anything to do with the case.

I refer to a railroad accident in which my mother was injured several years ago and from which she suffered the intensest agony, being bedfast, for an entire year, and almost totally helpless. Nothing the physicians or nurse could do seemed to bring any relief. Expenses of doctors, nurses, medicines, etc., increased so that it became necessary to mortgage the farm to pay debts. For months my mother had practically nothing to do but lie in bed and think about her own affliction

and worry over what to her were the terrors of a mortgage on the home and the ordeal and expense of possibly several years of litigation in court in a suit for damages from the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

We tried everything suggested as a remedy, even an osteopath. After this osteopath's examination he asked but one question: "Is there a lawsuit pending against the railroad for this injury?" Learning that there was he replied "I cannot under any circumstances accept this case *until that suit is settled.*"

We did not understand him until some months later when the chief claim agent of Baltimore came to our home in Mansfield, Ohio, to settle our claim. He brought with him the instructor in nervous diseases of the Ohio Medical University of Columbus, Ohio, who, after a thorough scientific examination pronounced the disease *traumatic neurasthenia* and *hemi-anesthesia.* In plainer words, a paralysis of physical organs and their functions as a result of nervous shock induced by physical force.

This doctor told me: "I will stake my professional reputation upon the statement that as soon as you settle this litigation and relieve your mother's mind of it and of this mortgage she will begin to improve, and will improve rapidly until thoroughly recovered, but as long as this is not done she never will improve."

The case was satisfactorily settled, her worries removed, and this medical scientist's diagnosis and advice vindicated to the letter in that in a few months she went from her bed to a wheel-

chair, then upon crutches, then with a cane until entirely recovered and normal again.

If Eddyism or any other "ism" had been introduced to draw her attention away from herself and her injuries and troubles it would have done the same thing for her and I might have been a "Christian Scientist" instead of denouncing it as the very antichrist today. But Doweyism has done the same thing for thousands, so have Roman Catholic shrines and their shin-bones of the Saints from time immemorial.

This explains from the stand-point of science why the "Christian Science organization has the *largest percentage of women adherents* among all the religious sects in the United States—73 per cent—and why the vast percentage of its "cures" are performed upon neurotics, nearly all of whom are women.

Our contention is, that it is altogether possible to have this truth, which every physician and surgeon understands and makes use of in his wonderful science, without denying the personality of God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; without robbing Jesus the Christ of God of His deity or the Holy Ghost of His and blaspheming them both by identifying them with Mrs. Eddy's heresy; without making sin an illusion, and the atonement of Christ a farce; without denying the death of Christ and thus making Christ a liar; without denying the efficacy of Christ's blood shed on the Cross; without mocking prayer to a personal God, or without dethroning God's sweetest gifts to mankind outside of Christ, that is, the home and marriage and filling the world with nameless children whose only

father could be said to be "Christian Science" fully apprehended.

If this is the price that we must pay to see our loved ones healed of their physical ills, I say in the blessed name of Christ the Good Physician, *a thousand time better let them die in Christ rather than live to thus deny Him and set at nought His entire revelation in Holy Scripture and lose their souls eternally.* May God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the ever blessed and adorable triune God, bless, to your eternal salvation whatever of this message accords with His Word of Truth as that word of God has been set over against the word of a wicked, greedy, adulterous, soul-destroying woman. Amen.

EDDYISM'S ATROCITIES IN ITS WAR ON HOLY SCRIPTURES

TEXTS

1 Timothy 4: 1, 2, 6, 7.—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;

"Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron. . . . If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine whereunto thou hast attained.

"But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather to godliness."

2 Timothy 4: 1-4.—"I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; PREACH THE WORD; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine.

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the TRUTH, and shall be turned unto fables."

INCE the announcement of a purpose to throw the light of God's Word upon the crude and immoral fables of a certain greedy, untruthful, old, much-married, and divorced prophetess, whom Dr. G. Campbell Morgan likens to the Christ-condemned Jezebel of Thyatira, the pastor of this Church has been the recipient of considerable literature of this wierd cult bearing marked articles, one of which bears

the flaring headline "One's Own Business" from which we quote: "Take an example or two of interference with the concerns of others. One of the seeming causes of such conduct is selfishness. A man imagines himself to be superior to another; will-power asserts itself and he steps out of his own legitimate sphere, to interfere with one who perhaps according to the standards of men, may even be his superior in wisdom and knowledge and experience. Let a man be blinded with self-love and there is no end to the trouble he may seek to produce." "It is sheer waste of time to interfere with other people's affairs, viewed from the standpoint of absolute Science." "If a man is minding his own business he has little time at his disposal in which to interfere with the affairs of other people," etc.

Now, dear people, if we had not heard that same thing so often, emanating from the iniquitous forces of darkness and the devil we might have been somewhat concerned, especially when later we were called upon the phone by one of the local leaders of this so-called Church and advised as to whom we were indebted for this gratitutious supply of paper and ink.

But what preacher of God's Word has ever raised the sword of the spirit to smite the devilish works of darkness operating in the saloon, the brothel or the propaganda of organized greed and graft without hearing some mouth-piece of the devil say, *"Let the preachers mind their own business and let us alone?"*

I might even have been somewhat concerned had I not remembered that practically the same

words were hurled at our Lord Jesus Christ by the demons who had incarnated themselves in men, viz., "What have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time? (In other words, "Mind your own business, Christ, and let us alone awhile yet.")

But this is of the same piece of cloth from which all of the arguments for this modern Massachusetts witch-craft are taken.

While we were attempting vainly for some minutes to get this master in Israel to declare their attitude towards the deity of Jesus Christ, cuttle-fish-like he preferred to becloud matters by attempting to prove the divinity of their false religion on the grounds of its wealth, its members in the halls of congress and its lifting him from the gutter of Methodism by its healing.

Certainly it has money! Millions of money, but it is scarcely clear to any one who knows much of the financial standing of one Jesus of Nazareth, how this immense wealth proves its Christ-likeness.

Certainly it has its members in our national congress! But, if this be an argument conclusive of its divine origin, all Mormonism needs to do to prove its divine origin and the truth of its doctrines of polygamy and blood atonement, is to remind us of the connection it also has with those same sacred halls in the person of one Hon. Reed Smoot, U. S. Senator from Utah.

We shall have more to say in our next sermon relative to our failure to get any assurance that there shall be included with the literature to be sent from "Christian Science" headquarters,

such unchristian and unscientific publications as a "Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Churches of Christ Scientist" or the "Report of the Orphans' Home Boards of the Churches of Christ, Scientist," or the report of any board having in charge any social service or charitable work of this "Church of St. Bunco, the book agent."

No religion has a leg to stand on before the judgment seat of Christ whose only defense is its wealth, its senators, its social influence, its imaginary cures of imaginary ills, or its growth among neurotics.

The only touch-stone with which to determine the truth or falsity of any professed religion is its *agreement or disagreement with holy scripture.* Thus examined, Eddyism, the so-called "Christian Science," is proven to be what Paul in our text calls "profane and old wives' fables" which he says are to be refused and reproved and rebuked as the work of seducing spirits and the doctrines of devils.

I call your attention to Eddyism's Atrocities in its War on Holy Scripture.

1. The first and most fundamental doctrine of any religion is its doctrine concerning God. Let us therefore consider, first, Eddyism's atrocities in its treatment of the scriptural doctrine of God.

In the index to my copy of Science and Health* there is the entry "God as defined in Christian Science." Turning to page 225 we read "God is supreme Being, the only Life, Substance and Soul, the only Intelligence of the universe, including man." It is interesting to note that Life,

*The 154th Edition.

Substance, Soul and Intelligence, and similar words, are capitalized here and elsewhere. Page 226, "God is Spirit and Spirit is divine Principle, Principle is divine Mind, and Mind is not both good and bad, for God is Mind; therefore Mind is Good only, and there is but one Mind because there is but one God."

Here we have it then: God is supreme Being, Life, Substance, Soul, Intelligence, Spirit, Principle, Mind, Good. *All capitalized: all God.*

On page 230: "Soul and Spirit are one. God is Soul. Therefore there can be but one Soul. Soul is Spirit, Divine Principle." On page 231: "Mind is divine Principle, reality, and can produce nothing unlike Himself, God, the eternal Love."

In "Science and Health" (index) page 616 we read, "God as a Principle, not person saves man instead of pardons him."

On page 227: "Life, Truth and Love constitute the triune God, or triply divine Principle. They represent a trinity in unity, three in one—the same in essence, though multiform in office: God the Father; Christ the type of Son-ship; Divine Science or the Holy Comforter." . . . "The Holy Ghost or Spirit, reveals this triune Principle, and is expressed in Divine Science, which is the Comforter, leading into all Truth, and revealing the divine Principle of the universe."

Christian Science has no idea of, and does not teach a personal God. Its God is an impersonal, all-pervasive Principle filling the universe, which universe is itself inseparable from, coexistent with, and self-existent with this Principle, in fact iden-

tical with this Principle. There is no other substance than this Principle. Man and this Principle are identical. Nature and this Principle are identical. Science and Health on page 13 says: "This Principle, Mind, God never created matter, in the very nature of the case could not create matter, in fact there is no matter; All is Mind, God is Mind; God is All-in-all."

The Standard Dictionary's definition of *pantheism* is, "The doctrine that identifies with the One Substance all finite physical and mental existences, as its more or less illusory and transient modes or manifestations; the doctrine which holds that the self-existent and self-developing universe conceived of as a whole, is God. . . . . In its more spiritualistic form it is apt to deny the true personality of man, and reduce all human experience to an illusory and evanescent fragment of the divine reason, the latter term, even, being employed with an impersonal signification."

If this is not a *perfect match for Eddyism* and if "Science and Health" does not teach *pantheism* instead of the scriptural doctrine of a personal God, and if the author of "Science and Health" was not a *pantheist* instead of a Christian, then Spinoza himself was not a pantheist.

The copyrighter of "Science and Health" has no other excuse for claiming to teach a triune God, three persons in one God, or even in any sense a personal God, than *the sole excuse of the wolf in sheep's clothing.* She uses these terms *simply to deceive and delude.* Her God should never be thought of as a personal God or referred to by any other than the impersonal pronoun "IT."

With this Word of God, from the creation record on its first page to the prophesy of Christ's return to judgment on its last page, literally filled and made up of references to, and a revelation of a personal God who creates, speaks, loves, hates, pities, shows mercy, punishes, is long suffering, is grieved, and a thousand other acts and attributes which we can never think of ascribing to anything but a personal entity, how can any sane person accept this old wives' fable, this doctrine of devils that the God of the Scriptures is a Principle and not a person? *On page 308 of "Science and Health" God is actually likened to the principle of mathematics.*

Spelling Principle with a capital "P" certainly does not atone for such ATROCITIES on holy scripture. In "Science and Health," edition of 1906, page 569, Mrs. Eddy represents God as "divine Principle" — as Life represented by the Father; as Truth represented by the Son; as Love represented by the Mother," and when we remember that she made a by-law for the "Mother-Church" forbidding any Christian Scientist to give the title "Mother" to any one else on earth except herself and one's own mother in the flesh, and when we remember how she blasphemously attempts to write her own name into the Lord's model prayer, making it to read "Our Father, Mother God" instead of "Our Father who art in heaven," I say when we remember these repeated attempts to rob almighty God of His personality, while at the same time trying to *crowd her own self into the trinity,* we have here the most shameful atrocity on God and His word imaginable!

2. Eddyism's atrocities on Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God and Savior of the world, are on a par with its atrocities upon the personality of God the Father.

"Science and Health" on page 334 says, "The virgin-mother conceived this idea of God, and gave to her ideal the name Jesus." Have you been so carnally minded as to believe there was ever a *real babe,* born in a stable, wrapped in swaddling clothes and laid in a manger? Let the light of the star of Boston enlighten your benighted soul to the fact that the virgin's womb was her mind; by communion with divine Principle there was conceived in her mind an *idea* of God; that idea was born as an *ideal* and given the name Jesus. "Science and Health" says, *"Mary's conception of him was spiritual,"* mark you, not actually conceived by the Holy Ghost and actually born of the virgin Mary, an actual physical baby laid in an actual manger. No! But Jesus is spiritualized away into an *idea,* and *ideal,* or as we read on page 335, "Jesus was the offspring of Mary's self-conscious communion with God." Eddyism's Babe of Bethlehem is a mental babe, an idea and ideal of mind and not a babe in the flesh, a real, an actual baby. Is not this an atrocity on the gospel accounts of the nativity? Is not this atrocity upon the scriptural doctrine of the incarnation denounced as anti-Christ by John in the words: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come IN THE FLESH, is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come."

Eddyism commits another atrocity on Jesus

Christ, our divine-human Saviour, when it attempts to divide him into two entities, thus causing a duality for which there is absolutely no warrant in Scripture.

"Science and Health" on page 229 says, "By these sayings he meant, not that Jesus was eternal, but that the divine idea or Christ was so." "Not that the Father was greater than Spirit, which was and is God, but greater, infinitely greater than the fleshly Jesus whose earthly career was for a day. . . . This dual personality, of the unseen and the seen, the spiritual and material, the Christ and Jesus, continued until the Master's ascension; when the human, the corporeal concept, or Jesus, disappeared."

Mark you, she does not say the "corporeal Jesus" disappeared, but the *"corporeal concept, Jesus disappeared."* The disciples looked upon Jesus and regarded Him as having a body with flesh and bones. But this was an "illusion of their mortal senses," a "false belief." When this was dispelled, naturally Jesus was dispelled — "the corporeal concept, Jesus disappeared."

This means nothing more nor less than that there really *never was any incarnation.* This great Christian doctrine which is the very foundation of Christianity is utterly vitiated if Eddyism is true, and we must say, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him." He has *"disappeared."* What an atrocity this doctridne of devils is upon such scripture as Hebrews 13:8, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today and forever." Or upon the words of the angel to the sorrowing disciples

at the time of Christ's ascension: "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."

Eddyism on page 229 of "Science and Health" teaches that Jesus was but for a day and then was annihilated—"disappeared"—Christ alone continued to exist after the ascension "in the eternal order of Divine Science."

This so-called "Christian Science" denies that Christ *has come* in the flesh, and 1 John 4:3 says that denial is inspired by the spirit of anti-Christ; "Christian Science" goes further and denies that Christ in His second coming *will come* in the flesh and thus makes the angel on the Mount of Ascension a liar, and furthermore, it makes John a liar the second time for saying in 2 John 7, "For many deceivers are going forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the anti-Christ."

But, Beloved, what have we here in this heresy? Something new under the sun? Something original with the copyrighter of "Science and Health?" She claims so. But here again history contradicts her.

This duality between Mrs. Eddy's Jesus and her Christ is nothing other than *Nestorianism over again.* It is the heresy of Nestorius of Constantinople which was condemned by the early Christian Church at the Council of Ephesus in the year 431. It is the creed of the Nestorian sect in Persia to this day, and was 1,444 years old when the author of "Science and Health" attempted to foist

it upon an ignorant and unsuspecting world as a new thing under the sun in 1875. This is an atrocity even upon ordinary intelligence.

Passing by, for lack of time, the atrocities which this woman, so incapable of telling the truth herself, commits upon the perfection of Jesus Christ by telling us what Jesus should have done differently *"had wisdom characterized all his sayings,"* and at the same time claiming infallibility for herself in everything from the giving of a divine revelation "higher, clearer and more permanent than that before," to the selection of the men to manage its publication, we call your attention to her atrocities upon the scriptural accounts of the atonement.

"Science and Health" on page 349 says, "The lonely precincts of the tomb gave Jesus a refuge from His foes, and a place in which to solve the great problem of Being. His three days work in the sepulchre set the seal of eternity on time." "He depended not upon food or pure air to resuscitate wasted energies." . . . "Can it be called supernatural for the God of nature to sustain Jesus in His proof of man's truly derived power." . . . "His disciples believed Jesus dead while He was hidden in the sepulchre; whereas He was alive, demonstrating within the narrow tomb, the power of Spirit to destroy human, material sense. Our Master fully demonstrated Divine Science in its victory over death and the grave. Jesus' deed was for the enlightenment of men, and the salvation of the whole world from sin, sickness and death." (Mark you, I am still quoting "Science and Health" and I am quoting a full paragraph

that no one may say I have garbled her writings.) Mrs. Eddy goes on to say, "Paul writes: (For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the [seeming] death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His Life.) Three days after His bodily burial He talked with His disciples. The persecutors had failed to hide immortal truth and love in a sepulchre." Here ends the paragraph.

Now what have we here? Is this not *imposition* instead of *exposition?* This is not getting doctrine out of Scripture, it is writing false doctrine into Scripture. It is not interpreting Scripture, it is *mutilating Scripture.* This is literally substituting the word of a woman for the Word of God. This is the work of the devil begun in Eden when he injected the word *"not"* into what God had said, and thereby completely changed God's Word to read, "Ye shall not surely die." The devil, this time coming in the form of a woman instead of in the form of a serpent, would inject the word *"seeming"* to qualify the word "death" and thus put the lie to God speaking through Paul. Is this not an atrocity on Holy Scripture?

But this is not all. On pages 229 and 230 of "Science and Health" you may read this: "This was the 'Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,'—slain, that is, according to the testimony of the corporeal senses, but undying in the deific Mind. The Revelator represents the Son of Man as saying, (Rev. 1:17-18) I am the first and the last. I am He that liveth and was dead, not understood, and behold, I am alive forevermore.

This is a mystical statement of the eternity of the Christ, and is also a reference to the human sense of Jesus crucified."

When this vile woman changed the Word of God through Paul she did have respect enough for Paul to put in brackets the word ["seeming"] which she injected, but when she brazenly and blasphemously assumes to change the Word of the risen and glorified Christ, she does not even think it necessary to apologize to Him for changing His Word enough to put in brackets or in any other way indicate the unscripturalness of the words *"not understood"* which she injected into His unwilling lips.

Jesus Christ said, "I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive forevermore." Mrs. Eddy corrects Him and makes Jesus Christ say, "I am He that liveth and was dead, *not understood,* and behold, I am alive forevermore."

Is "Atrocity in her war upon Holy Scriptures" too strong an expression for us to use in characterizing such *impudence,* such *effrontery,* such unparalleled *blasphemy?*

The polygamist of Utah who takes to himself ten wives and justifies his action on the ungodly and devilish doctrine which he reads into Christ's parables of the ten pounds and the ten talents, has the lesser sin because he only ventures to change the intended meaning of Christ's words, while this much-married progressive polygamist of New England, to bolster up her unscriptural doctrines, *hesitates not to change completely not only the intended meaning but the actual words*

which were spoken by Christ and His inspired apostles.

THIS WEIRD CULT AND ITS TEACHINGS A FORM OF CHRISTIANITY, AND ENTITLED TO THE NAME "CHRISTIAN!!!" WHEN ALL ITS ATROCITIES ON SCRIPTURE AND THE MANIFEST TENDENCIES OF ITS TEACHINGS UPON CRIME, MORALITY, THE PURITY AND CHASTITY OF THE HOME, AND ESPECIALLY ITS PLAN FOR THE BIRTH OF CHILDREN BY MENTAL CONCEPTION, ARE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, THIS VILE RELIGION AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST SHOULD HARDLY BE MENTIONED IN THE SAME BREATH.

How this crude, crude religion should be able to attract the interest of any thinking person, only proves the truth of what a certain great showman once said about the American people; it is one of the best indications of just how absolutely *gullible* some people are in the matter of religion. I have said that it was crude! Permit me to illustrate from its own textbook: In "Science and Health," on pages 570 and 571, under a text from Revelation relative to the key of David and the open and closed door, there are the author's definitions for the word "Adam" in which this Old Testament character is run through the author's moving picture machine after the following fashion: "Adam:" error; a falsity; the belief in "original sin," sickness and death; evil; the opposite of Good or God, and His creation; a curse; a belief in intelligent matter, finiteness and mortality; "dust to dust;" red sandstone; nothingness; etc., etc., *ad nauseam.* Thirty lines, one entire page of such definitions for our first parent whom we

have been supposing was made in the image and likeness of God!!! But that is not all. She is not through with Adam even after all that. On page 233 we read, "The word Adam is from the Hebrew adamah, signifying the red color of the ground, dust, nothingness. Divide the name Adam into two syllables, and it reads, *a dam,* or obstruction. This suggests, the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind in solution, of the darkness which seemed to appear, when "darkness was on the face of the deep," and matter stood as opposed to Spirit, as that which is accursed."

If anything more crude than that has ever emanated from the state insane asylum in our city it is certainly devoutly to be hoped that the inmate who gave birth to the "Science" is not allowed to run at large.

Think of it! The author seems actually to have been possessed with the obsession that *God Almighty spoke Anglo-Saxon* and that this Anglo-Saxon could be chopped into syllables and still make sense, the very same sense, in any other language whatsoever into which God's Word might afterwards be translated. Apparently God never thought that there would some day be a German language, for if He had foreseen this He would have named the first man *"Ein-Deich,"* so that dividing it into two syllables it would suggest to the German speaking people as Mrs. Eddy says, *"a dam* or obstruction . . . the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind in solution, etc." Or, God never thought that there would be Syrians some day in that very country in which He placed Adam or He would have called His first man

"Al-haooz," so that these Syrians could "divide it into two syllables" and at once get the vision of *"a dam,* an obstruction to suggest the thought of something fluid of mortal mind in solution, etc."

Apparently it did not even occur to God that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and others of His people would some time speak the Hebrew language or He would have named the first man *"Ahad-Masgeer"* or *"Ahad-Sachar,"* so that His chosen people might, upon merely hearing their original ancestor's name, have caught a vision of this Boston Prophetess' "dam" or "obstruction," suggesting something fluid, mortal mind in solution, or a *mental Niagara Falls or Gatun Dam in the Garden of Eden.* People who swallow such *crudities* as "divine inspiration" are deserving of pity rather than censure.

Perhaps this explains why the local leader of this wierd cult who has been supplying me with their literature (except official reports of boards of foreign missions, orphans' homes or other charitable institutions of their so-called church) could not answer my question as to how many languages this "final revelation" has been translated into, except to say, "Never translated into any except possibly the German language."

Time forbids our taking up the atrocity this crude cult commits upon the third person of the adorable Trinity, the Holy Spirit, in identifying Him again and again with "Christian Science" as the Comforter. Aside altogether from its blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, one cannot escape the ridiculous inconsistency of a religion claiming to be in itself *the very Holy Ghost* and for forty

years steadfastly refusing to allow its bible of *divine afterthoughts* to be translated into the languages of all nations, for the very sign of the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost was the gift of tongues which at once put the gospel into the languages of the whole known world. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

Gladly would we take up yet with some fulness the atrocities of this religion in its war upon the scriptural doctrine of sin. Time permits us merely to mention a few proof texts from its *superbible:*—

"Science and Health" says on page 81: "The belief of sin which has grown terrible in strength and influence, is an unconscious error in the beginning." On page 528 it is spoken of as "the illusion of sin."

Page 444: "The sinner is not reformed merely by assuring him that he cannot be a sinner, because there is no sin. To put down the claim of sin you must detect it, remove the mask, point out the illusion, and thus get the victory over sin, and prove its unreality."

Page 207: "Sin exists only as long as the material illusion remains. It is the sense of sin and not the sinful soul which must be lost." "The reality of sin is the awful fact that unrealities seem real." What an atrocity upon such Scripture as this: "If we say we have not *sinned* we make God a liar and His word is not in us." Or this, Romans 5:12: "By one man *sin* entered into the world, and death by *sin;* and so death passed upon all men, for that *all have sinned.*"

Or Romans 3:23: "For *all have sinned* and come short of the glory of God."

Or 1 John 1:7: "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all *sin.*"

Or Gal. 3:22: "The Scripture hath concluded *all under sin.*"

But why go further? It is on every page of the Bible, and of history from Eden on to Golgotha, and from Golgotha on to now and to the end of time.

The Christian Scientist says, "God I thank Thee that I am not as other men are." The Christian says, "God be merciful to me a *sinner.*"

An agent came to our door this past week, saying, "I am taking the enrollment of the school, may I step in?" Certainly! A representative of our public school system was welcome in our home though we have no children of school age. But when he was permitted entrance he drew from hiding at the side of the door a large case—larger than seemed necessary for a school enumerator.

In a few seconds he was rattling off his lingo, trying to sell us some portraits of the two "most beautiful children he had seen for many months."

The first thing was to *"get in."* The second was by flattery and otherwise to "get an order" and *"make a sale."*

It is precisely so with this so-called "Christian Science." "Christian Science" first, last and all the time is a *book-agent* with a copyrighted book to sell at at least 500 per cent profit, and it is skilled in all the tricks of the book-agent.

It comes to us in the livery of heaven. It gets

in by telling you as I was told by phone this past week by one of its leaders, "Our religion teaches nothing but what your religion teaches;" it flatters us by denying that we are sinners or even have the capability of sinning. It quotes Scripture glibly. It believes in God, a triune God, Father, Son and Holy Comforter, etc., etc.

After it has sold us its books, torn us away from some Christian Church (for Eddyism seldom ever makes a convert from the world, it is perpetually a proselyter from the fold of Christ), after it has torn us from the Church of Jesus, the Son of God, we come to realize we have been "taken in" by a typical book-agent, a vender of what Paul calls "old wives fables."

It "accepts" the doctrine of God, defines Him as Principle, Mind, Soul, etc., and "hands you" an impersonal God that ought always be referred to as *"it."*

It "believes in the same Jesus Christ you believe in," then declares that His conception of the virgin was wholly mental and that He was born not as a child, but as a divine idea or ideal, or corporeal concept.

It "believes in the death of Jesus Christ," but only a *seeming* death. It talks of the "cleansing blood of Jesus," but it is the "blood coursing through His veins" as He went about His Father's business, and not the blood shed on the cross for sin.

It speaks of the Holy Ghost, but its reference all the while is not to the third Person of the Trinity of whom you are thinking as the promised Comforter, but to this crude, wierd and immoral

religion which is a combination of pantheism, Nestorianism, Quimbyism, mesmerism, witchcraft and nonsense.

Again and again its identity may be found in the Anti-Christ whose coming was prophesied in Holy Scripture.

But Paul calls it the religion of seducing spirits, the doctrines of devils and old wives' fables.

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron . . . If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine whereunto thou hast attained."

"But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness."

Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables."

God forbid that it should be so with you who have opened your hearts to God's Word today as set over against the work of a wicked, mercenary, wordly woman. Amen.

EDDYISM'S LESSON TO TRUE CHRISTIANITY

TEXTS

Colossians 1: 23.—"If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard."

Ephesians 4: 14.—"That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and caried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

1 Peter 3: 15.—". . . . Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear."

Titus 1: 9-11.—"Holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers. . . . whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake."

E are living in a day of fads. In a day in which anything, no matter how senseless or ridiculous, can get a following, provided only that it be said to be "the very latest" or the "fashionable" thing. This obtains in everything from senseless fads in clothing to senseless fads in religion. The Athenians who surrounded Paul on Mars' Hill are with us to this day, "for all the Athenians and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing," so

that we have a "bargain counter" loaded with religious fads, from the "made-in America" brands to the "made-in-India" brands, and as the bargain hunters pick them over in their choosing, we hear but one query, viz., "I wonder if this is the very latest?" The local Unitarian organization, for example, lately posted this bulletin before its building: "Would you use your grand-father's machinery? Then why his religion?" In other words, no matter how unscriptural a religion is, just so it be the very latest thing out, and so it may be said to be quite popular among a certain self-constituted "patrician class" or social aristocracy of the neighborhood. This is the chief argument being advanced for Eddyism in this so-called "fashionable West-end" of Toledo.

Our mothers were old-fashioned enough to believe that a little soap and water properly applied every day did not hurt any part of our infantile anatomy, but Mrs. Eddy speaking as an inspired prophetess in a revelation "higher, clearer and more permanent than that before" came through Jesus or Paul or any others, says in "Science and Health" on page 411: "The daily ablutions of an infant are no more natural or necessary, than would be the process of taking a fish out of water every day, and covering it with dirt, in order to make it thrive more vigorously thereafter in its native element." No matter how ridiculous it may be to attempt to palm such "twaddle" off as divine inspiration, this is the very "latest." This comes from a mother; a mother who abandoned to a former servant her only child and allowed him to grow to manhood without ability to either read

or write, so that her own father, Mark Baker, had to say, "Mary acted like an old ewe that wouldn't own its lamb;" a mother so unnatural that after treating her own infant in this way, later in life legally adopted a full grown forty-year-old man as her son and gave him the name of "Foster-Eddy."

The fashionable dames of our fashionable West End who are noted for their very large (?) families may adopt this anti-bath religion for their unwelcome children as something "new" and something "different," but true mothers will not be influenced much by "inspirations" from such an unnatural mother, who, after at least three marriages characterized marriage as "synonomous with legalized lust" in her message at the dedication of a $2,000,000.00 "mother church," as reported in the "Christian Science Sentinel" of June 16, 1906, and the "Christian Science Journal" of July, 1906.

Another example of this insipid philosophy which the fashionable patricians of this neighborhood are extolling as something "new" and as "science" and therefore worthy of all acceptation, may be found on pages 484 and 485 of the "Christian Science" text-book, viz., "The less mind there is manifested in matter, the better. When the unthinking lobster loses his claw, it grows again. If the Science of Life were understood, it would be found that the senses of Mind are never lost, and that matter has no sensation. Then the human limb would be replaced as readily as the lobster's claw—not with an artificial limb, but with a genuine one."

In other words, the less mind you have and

the nearer you approach the unthinking lobster in your mental caliber, the better "Christian Scientist" you will make, and here, for once, we have no disposition to dispute with the author of "Science and Health"—she ought to know! She became a millionaire in the lobster business.

From innumerable similar gems of this so-called "science" I have selected these two illustrations of the bathless baby and the lobster-minded man as fair illustrations of what Paul in one of our texts calls "every wind of doctrine." Paraphrasing Paul's words, may we not say, without fear of contradiction, that people who can accept as divinely inspired such insipid vaporings of diseased mentality are certainly, mentally speaking, "children tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

One of the most notable things about the ordinary congregation of Mrs. Eddy's followers is that practically all of them are proselyted from various Christian denominations. Converts from the world of sin and wickedness are conspicuous for their absence. Run over in your mind the followers of this wierd cult with whom you are acquainted and the probability is that you will recall very few, if any at all, who were not formerly members of some branch of the Christian Church. This so-called Church of Christ which in its journals and books most piously contends that it is exemplifying the "Golden Rule" in its love for other churches, is the most vicious of all proselyting propagandists in the land today.

Its happy hunting ground for members is found in the inactive, disgruntled and unindoctrinated of every sect who are looking for an easy-going form of godliness under the guise of a religio-social club to salve the conscience into quiescense by teaching that there is neither personal God nor personal devil; nor any sin in reality, nor hell or any eternal retribution for the ungodly.

This being the case I call your attention to "Eddyism's Lesson to True Christianity."

Its chief lesson to Christianity teaches us the necessity of indoctrination in the true Christian faith as set forth sufficiently and finally in the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

It teaches by its horrible contrast what Paul would teach us in our first text, viz., that if we are to continue in the Christian faith and not be moved away from the hope of the Gospel, we must be grounded and settled in the doctrine of Christianity.

Or as Paul teaches in our second text, we must all come into the knowledge of the Son of God, unless we are to be like helpless children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, and by the sleight and cunning craftiness of men who are lying in wait to deceive such children.

It teaches us the necessity of the "preparedness" which Peter urges in our third text, that we be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason for the hope that is in us.

It teaches us by its identity in conduct with those whom Paul rebukes in our fourth text, just

how tenaciously we must hold fast the faithful word as we have been taught, that we may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. Eddyism, unmasked and dragged unwillingly into the light of history and God's Word, is an illustration that, in our day as in Paul's day, there are, as Paul says in our fourth text, "many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers . . . whose mouths must be stopped who subvert whole houses, teaching things they ought not for filthy lucre's sake."

The only adequate "preparedness" against this proselyting propagandist and the books she seeks to market, aside from the poverty of the indigent orphan, the heathen or the habitue of the slums, is the preparedness of a knowledge of what God's Word teaches, and then a respect for that Word as infinitely superior to the word of any man or woman, angel or devil.

The claim of Chas. T. Russell, the founder of the "Millenium Dawn" heresy and author and copyrighter of another "key" to lock the Scriptures, that the majority of his followers are won from that one of the Protestant Churches which does least to indoctrinate its youth, while comparatively few are won from those churches which like our own indoctrinate both old and young in catechetical instruction and doctrinal preaching would doubtless also be found to obtain in any analysis which might be made of the sources from which the followers of Mrs. Eddy have been proselyted.

In our catechetical instruction we Lutherans teach our people from youth up the Ten Command-

ments and the sin and consequences of their violation; we then indoctrinate them in the fundamental things of the Christian faith as set forth in brief summary in the Apostles' Creed; we next take up the study of prayer as taught by Christ in His Model Prayer; then follows a thorough study of the divinely appointed Means of Grace, the Word of God and the Sacraments, Holy Baptism and the Holy Communion.

Let us see how such a grounding and settling in the Word of God and its teaching would save any one from the sin of rejecting the Word of God and accepting instead the word of a woman on these fundamental things.

1. How can any one who has ever made anything like a heart-searching study of the Ten Commandments and their meaning and requirements as set forth in the Small Catechism of Luther, ever be "carried about by such winds of doctrine," such "old wives' fables," such "doctrines of devils" as that which this so-called "Christian Science" teaches on the question of Sin?

How could any one who knows what God's Word teaches on the reality, the heinousness, or the penalty of sin, believe the word of any woman, much less such a woman as history proves the author of "Science and Health" to have been, when she teaches such things as this which I quote from her:

"Man is incapable of sin."

"The only reality of sin is the awful fact that unrealities seem real."

"Evil is but an illusion." "It is a false belief."

"Sin exists only so long as the material illu-

sion remains. It is the sense of sin and not the sinful soul, which must be lost."

Everywhere sin is treated as "nothingness" and the possibility of the soul sinning is denied in the strongest terms that language can provide.

Either Mrs. Eddy's word and God's Word are irreconcilably and totally antagonistic to one another or else the plain English language as all others use it is an entirely different tongue from the English she and her followers use. For on the question of sin and its consequences there is the identical difference that is found between the language of God in Eden and the language of the devil speaking then through a serpent but later through a woman.

The one said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" the other says, "Ye shall not surely die."

These two words are irreconcilably and eternally antagonistic; one is of God, the other of the devil; one is of heaven, the other of hell.

Precisely the same analogy exists between the Bible and "Science and Health;" between God's Word and Christianity on one side and the word of this woman and her religion which Paul calls the work of "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils" on the other.

Aside from the poverty of the heathen or the penury of the orphan and the habitue of the slum and tenement, there is no "preparedness" against these "wiles of the devil" like a knowgledge and respect for God's Word in its teachings on sin, its universality, its heinousness and its penalties.

Eddyism is a warning to every Christian to

"hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers, who are teaching things they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake."

2. The same "preparedness" of a grounding in the Word of God and a respect for that Word in its teachings on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as briefly summarized in the Apostles' Creed is necessary if the Christian is to be immune against the assaults of his adversary, the devil, who comes not with hoofs and horns, but this time in the form of a woman and her followers, to substitute for those doctrines the doctrines of devils which we considered somewhat fully in our previous lecture.

The one who knows and accepts the scriptural teaching that God is a personal God and not an impersonal Principle, Mind, Soul, etc., is as safe from the assaults of Eddyism as the pitiful, penniless orphan or the benighted heathen who have no money to pay out for its publications or its practitioners, and in whom Eddyism consequently is not interested.

No one who knows the Word of God to accept it is in danger of permitting any woman to rob God of His deity and personality in order to make room in the Trinity to crowd into that Trinity any person, male or female, who would blasphemously come to us as the representative of the "motherhood of God" and displace from that Trinity both the Logos or second Person and the Holy Spirit or third Person, and in the place of each and both of these substitute her infernal religion under the

guise of Divine Science. ("Science and Health" on pages 28, 227, 579, etc.)

No Christian who knows and accepts the scriptural doctrine of God and creation will or can accept the *pantheism* of Eddyism.

No Christian who knows and accepts the scriptural doctrine of the person and nature of the God-man, Christ Jesus, will or can accept the *Nestorianism* of Eddyism on this point, or make Him a mere "Way-shower" who is, as "Science and Health" on page 28 says, "Demonstrably Christian Science."

No Christian who is a Christian in any sense of the word will be deluded by Eddyism's repeated denial of the death of Jesus Christ; no Christian who knows the Word of God and respects it but will rebel in righteous indignation against Mrs. Eddy's mutilation of such Scripture as Romans 5:10, in which she changes God's Word from "reconciled to God by the death of His Son" to "reconciled to God by the SEEMING death of His Son;" or against he mutilation of the words of the risen, glorified Christ, in which she changes His Word in Rev. 1:18 from "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore," to the word of a woman of superior wisdom, reading "I am he that liveth and was dead, not understood, and behold I am alive forevermore."

It needs only a knowledge of the Word of God itself to see at once the mutilation, the atrocity, the blasphemy, the satanic violence upon, and disregard for the Word of God and its clear teachings everywhere throughout the books which "Christian Science" constantly and actually if not

admittedly makes superior to the infallible word of Holy Scriptures.

3. In the third place, Eddyism teaches the Christian how necessary it is to be thoroughly grounded and settled in the scriptural doctrine of Prayer as taught by Christ, in order that the Christian may not be deceived by the wiles of the devil, who comes to us in Eddyism, piously pretending to believe in and depend upon prayer as no Christian does, while at the same time in reality this so-called "Christian Science" vitiates prayer into a *"hindrance,"* an *"error* which impedes spiritual growth," "a blind belief," a *"safety valve for wrong-doing,"* and the foolishness of "standing before a black-board and praying to the principle of mathematics to work out the problem."

In the very nature of the case, from the standpoint of logic, "Christian Science" and prayer are fundamentally and eternally inconsistent with one another. Christian prayer is not only unnecessary and useless, but it is *absolutely impossible* in "Christian Science."

The very nearest approach to anything like Christian prayer in "Christian Science" is an inward, entirely subjective and always unexpressed longing or desire for something.

"Science and Health" says on page 308, "Prayer cannot change the Science of Being." (The capitals indicate that God is meant.) "The habit of pleading with the divine Mind as one pleads with a human being, perpetuates the belief in God as humanly circumscribed—an error which impedes spiritual growth."

Here is the secret of the logical impossibility of Christian prayer in "Christian Science." The "Christian Scientist" must think of God as Principle, Mind, Soul, etc., and not as a personal God, and he must not only think of God as being essentially impersonal but also of man as being essentially impersonal, coexistent with God and really a part of God. Otherwise his "spiritual growth is impeded."

Logically, therefore, anything in any wise like Christian prayer is impossible between impersonal man and impersonal God, who really are not only coexistent with one another but actually identical with one another. Prayer under such circumstances between man and God is as illogical, as unnecessary and as utterly impossible in the Christian sense as prayer between body and soul.

You will never find prayer as taught and practiced by Christ and His apostles ridiculed more shamelessly in the writings of the most blatant agnostic than in the chapter on Prayer in "Science and Health," Chapter X, pages 307-322.

Page 309: "We admit theoretically that God is good, omnipotent and omnipresent; and then we try to give information to this infinite Mind, and we plead for unmerited pardon, and a liberal outpouring of benefactions."

In other words: "O, Christ, how wicked, and hypocritical of Thee to pray audibly as Thou didst in that upper room, saying, 'I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work Thou gavest me to do.' Why, O Christ, thus try to 'give information' to omniscient and omnipresent God? Why didst Thou say audibly in that prayer, 'I

pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world but that Thou shouldst keep them from evil'? O, Christ, why didst Thou not know better than to give Thy followers this harmful, this hindering, this erroneous example of trying to give information to this infinite Mind and pleading for a liberal outpouring of benefactions?"

Again "Science and Health," on page 311, says, "If prayer nourishes the belief that sin is cancelled and that man is made better by merely praying, it is an evil."

In the next paragraph, "Calling on Him to forgive our work, badly done or left undone, implies the vain supposition that we have nothing to do but to ask pardon, and that afterwards we shall be free to repeat the offense."

In other words: "O, Christ, why didst Thou teach us to pray, 'Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors'? Why, O Christ, didst Thou thyself fall into such gross error as to pray, 'Father forgive them for they know not what they do'?"

"Science and Health," on page 312, says: "God is Love. More than this we cannot ask; higher than this we cannot look; farther we cannot go. To suppose that God forgives or punishes sin, according as His mercy is sought or unsought, is to misunderstand Love, and make prayer the safety-valve for wrong doing."

In other words: "O, Christ, this is Thy sin, committed in Thy first word from the cross, 'Father forgive them for they know not what they do.' Knowing that God was love, and still supposing that God would forgive their sin according

as Thou wouldst seek His mercy for them, Thou hast misunderstood love and made prayer the safety-valve for wrong doing." Come forth, Thou Christ, kneel humbly before Thy successor and superior in Boston and confess with shame Thy sin!

"Science and Health," on page 313, says: "God is not influenced by man. The divine ear is not an auditorial nerve. It is the all-hearing and all-knowing Mind, to whom each want of man is always known, and by whom it will be supplied." "The danger from audible prayer is that it may lead us into temptation. By it we may become involuntary hypocrites," etc.

In other words: "O, Christ, why didst Thou ever lead us into this folly and temptation by saying to us, 'If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven'?"

O Christ, Thou shouldst have known that "God is not influenced by man." Thou shouldst have known that this "agreeing on earth as to what we shall ask for," connotes and requires "audible prayer" which is "dangerous in that it may lead us into temptation and make involuntary hypocrites of us."

O Christ, confess again Thy sin to Mrs. Eddy and her followers. Remembering that God is everywhere and constantly referred to in "Science and Health" as "Principle," your attention will be arrested by this marginal index at the foot of page 31, viz., "Principle unforgiving," and reading the subject matter you will be astounded at these words: "Mere legal pardon, (and there is no other,

for Principle never pardons our sins or mistakes) leaves the offender free to repeat the offense."

"God is Principle" and "Principle never pardons our sins or mistakes." What does this mean but that God never pardons our sins or mistakes?

What is this but to put the lie to practically every writer of these sacred pages and even to the Son of God. Little wonder that such a religion should regard even Christ's prayer for His crucifiers' forgiveness as the safety-valve for wrong doing.

"Science and Health," on pages 317 and 318, says: "The prayer of faith shall save the sick, says the Scripture. What is this healing prayer? A mere request that God will heal the sick has no power to gain more of the divine presence than is always at hand. The only beneficial effect of such prayer for the sick is on the human mind, making it act more powerfully on the body, through a blind faith in God. This however, is one belief casting out another,—a belief in the unknown, casting out a belief in sickness."

"This common custom of praying for the recovery of the sick, finds help in blind belief; whereas help should come from the enlightened understanding. Does Deity interpose in behalf of one worshipper, and yet not help another? If the sick recover because they pray or are prayed for audibly, only petitioners, (per se or by proxy) should get well."

The same idea of *prayer to God amounting to no more than its effect upon the human mind,* making it act more powerfully on the body through blind faith in God, is reiterated on page 321 in the

words: "Such prayer is answered, inasmuch as *we put our desires into practice.*"

In other words, there is no God that heareth and answereth prayer *but ourselves,* and this is the only logical conclusion to come to for the one who empties both God and man of personality and makes them co-existent and identical with one another.

Surely one who has been grounded in the scriptural doctrine and practice of prayer as set forth in Luther's Catechism under the Lord's Prayer would not be tossed to and fro, and carried about by such winds of doctrine, so manifestly unscriptural and so *absolutely unchristian.*

He would at least be saved the sin of accepting Mrs. Eddy's blasphemous mutilation of what Christians regard as the perfect prayer, the model prayer, and are just unchristian and unscientific enough to believe that when Christ gave that prayer and said, *"After this manner* therefore pray ye," He meant what He said and never intended anyone, much less such an one as facts prove Mrs. Eddy to be, to drag into His perfect prayer such slander as this which she commands to be mixed with Christ's perfect words:

"Our Father-Mother God, all-harmonious. Adorable One.

Thy kingdom is come, Good is ever-present and omnipotent.

Enable us to know,—as in Heaven so on earth, God is All in all.

Give us grace for today; feed Thou the famished affections;

And divine Love is reflected in love;

And leadeth us not in temptation, but delivereth us from evil,—sin, disease and death.

For God is omnipresent Good, Substance, Life, Truth, Love."

In other words, "O, Christ, we are dissatisfied with Thy model prayer; it has no place in it for adoration of Mother Mary Baker, Glover, Patterson, Eddy, therefore, O Christ, we refuse to pray after this manner as Thou hast commanded, for *we prefer to pray after the manner Mother Mary commanded.*

4. Eddyism has surprisingly little to say about baptism, but no one who has any knowledge of what the Scriptures teach on Christian Baptism will be deluded by Eddyism's mutilation of this blessed life-giving sacrament into mere *"submergence in Truth"* as it is defined in "Science and Health" on pae 572.

This doubtless accounts for the absence of baptismal-fonts from "Christian Science" meeting houses, and the members of this wierd cult, if they have any idea that water should have any part whatever in baptism, can doubtless ease their consciences by reflecting that practically all of their members, having been proselyted from Christian Churches, have received Christian baptism *elsewhere.*

5. Eddyism's mutilation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is even worse than its treatment of the Sacrament of Baptism, if that is possible.

She does away forever with it all by resolving

Christ's breaking of bread into His explaining of truth, and she *out-Romanizes* the Roman Catholic Church by *banishing the cup entirely* and making it identical with the cup of sorrow which Christ drank in Gethsemane, and by *treating the bread in the same way.*

"Science and Health," on page 337, says: "The true sense is spiritually lost if the sacrament is confined to bread and wine. The disciples had eaten, yet Jesus prayed, and gave them bread. This would have been foolish in a literal sense."

Christ says, *"Do this in remembrance of me,"* but Mrs. Eddy says in "Science and Health," on page 339, "If Christ, Truth, has come to us in demonstration, no commemoration is requisite, for he is Immanuel or God with us; and if a friend be with us *why need memorials."*

The result is that Christ's Last Supper is done away with forever in Eddyism and instead is substituted *Mrs. Eddy's breakfast* of which we read in "Science and Health," on page 340, "This spiritual meeting with our Lord, in the dawn of a new light, is the morning meal which Christian Scientists commemorate. They bow before Christ, Truth, and receive more of His reappearing, and silently commune with the divine Principle thereof."

Mrs. Eddy leaves nothing more of Baptism or the Lord's Supper than she leaves of the personality of God, the deity or personality of either Jesus Christ or the Holy Spirit, or their work of creation, salvation and regeneration, or prayer or any other sacred thing she has ever laid her vile hands upon.

Against all this desecration of holy things there is but one preparedness aside from the penury of the indigent orphan or the poverty of the heathen, namely, the preparedness of a grounding in the Word of God.

The most contemptible phase of all this desecration of holy things and mutilation of Holy Scripture, is that, of it all, from Mrs. Eddy down to the latest practitioners, we can, nay we must say, as Paul says in our text, "teaching things they ought not FOR FILTHY LUCRE'S SAKE."

In "Retrospection and Introspection" she tells us very piously how God *impelled* her to set a price on Christian Science mind healing and how she *shrank* from doing so, and how she was led of God to name $300.00 as the price for each pupil in one course of lessons lasting barely three weeks. How much Mary *SHRANK* from accepting God's quotation of $300.00 for twelve lessons may be imagined from the fact that a bit later she raised the price to $300.00 for seven lessons, cash strictly in advance. Besides this she very *"shrinkingly"* extorted a royalty of ten per cent of the income of her students who should practice her bogus healing system and $1,000.00 forfeit from those whose conscience would not permit them, after they saw through her system, to go out and receive money under false pretenses.

The greed of Eddyism may be seen again in the fact that whereas a Bible may be bought for seventeen cents, the very cheapest edition of "Science and Health" costs three dollars, and from that up to six dollars—representing a profit of at least five hundred per cent.

Time forbids us to show the greed manifest in the constant production of new editions with no more change than the adding of two insignificant lines to one page, or the rearrangement of chapters and paging simply to force the faithful to junk their copies and buy the latest at the regular price.

Neither have we time to expose her lust for filthy lucre as shown in her lucrative spoon and picture business.

May I give but one more proof of the fact that Mrs. Eddy's first, last and only object as a "prophetess" seems to be greed and graft. On December 21, 1898, after it was safe to presume all regular Christmas gifts were already received or mailed to her, she had published in "The Christian Science Sentinel" the following:—

A CARD

"Beloved: I ask this favor of all Christian Scientists. Do not give me on, before or after the forthcoming holidays, aught material except three tea jackets. All may contribute to these. One learns to value material things only as one needs them, and the costliest things are those one needs least. Among my present needs material are these three jackets. Two of darkish heavy silk, the shade appropriate to white hair. The third of heavy satin, lighter shade, but sufficiently sombre. Nos. 1 and 2 to be common-sense jackets for Mother to work in, and not over-trimmed by any means. No. 3 for best, such as she can afford for her drawing room.

MARY BAKER EDDY."

Could anything be plainer than this parting fools of their money and then coming back to milk the "strippings"? "Teaching things they ought not for filthy lucre's sake."

Much ado is made of this greedy prophetess' benefactions, but when everyone of them is investigated it will be found that the only charity of this multi-millionaire inspiration vender, this greatest religious charlatan since the days of Judas Iscariot, is the unavoidable charity found in the truth of the statement that *a shroud has no pockets.*

Mrs. Eddy's so-called church is like its mother. It has not a dollar to give to anyone but itself. Of course it has no hospitals, but how does this excuse the fact that it has *no orphans' homes, no hospices, no homes for the aged, no homes for fallen women, no rescue missions, no foreign mission Board nor any foreign mission work, no charitable institutions of any kind whatsoever* except their book stores and agencies which they would have you believe are *charitable agencies* because they call them "Free Reading Rooms?"

In the latest U. S. Government Census Report you will find in quotation marks some Christian Scientist's estimate of the public charity rendered by them in the wonderful *curative effects* of their church services, their reading rooms and their lectures, and how these take the place of the charities and social service work of the Christian Churches.

This is followed by the government's representative's own estimate in the following words which are not in quotation marks: "The actual treatment of cases, however, is generally carried

on in direct connection with the churches and A REGULAR FEE IS CHARGED. INDIVIDUAL PRACTITIONERS GIVE TREATMENT ON MUCH THE SAME BASIS AS ORDINARY PHYSICIANS." (The only difference is that Mrs. Eddy advises that the quicker the practitioner is paid the quicker the cure will be effected.)

The Government Report adds, "General evangelistic, philanthropic and educational work along the lines carried out by other denominations is practically unknown."

Elsewhere in this report is the statement: "The smallest percentage of males shown (in all of the religious sects of America) is that for the Church of Christ, Scientist, viz., twenty-seven per cent." Evidently men do not take to the idea of the Motherhood of God or trailing after *Mrs. Eddy's skirts.*

In conclusion, may I declare that aside from the soul-destroying doctrines of devils which Eddyism teaches, its saddest feature is the *slaughter of the innocents* of which it is guilty before God and civilization. May I suggest that "Christian Science" lecturers use as samples of their "healing" some little innocent children I can name them in this immediate neighborhood who, placed before their audiences with their needlessly crippled and feeble little bodies, would cry out so loudly for vengeance that no sane audience would permit any man or woman to raise the voice in favor of such a hell-born religion of seducing spirits?

The ancient Jews imported from the Ammonites a god named Molech. This god was made of iron and heated red with fire and into its burning

arms the parents threw their helpless little babes, meanwhile drowning their infants' pitiable cries with a pandemonium of shouts from frenzied and fanatical devotees.

That cruel, child-devouring god Molech is with us in this very neighborhood.

Its name, by the most shameful contradiction of terms, is "Christian Science."

Amen.

The word of a woman, versus the word of God; three lectures on E
Bell, Alvin E. (Alvin Eugene), 1882-1967
BX6955 .B4
University of Connecticut Libraries
[15] wordofwomanversu00bell